

Image reconstruction without prior information

K. S. Cover (Keith@kscover.ca)

MEG Centre, VU University Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

(Dated: February 2, 2008)

Abstract

A novel framework for designing image reconstruction algorithms for linear forward problems is proposed. The framework is based on the novel concept of conserving the information in the data during image reconstruction rather than supplementing it with prior information. The framework offers an explanation as to why the popular reconstruction algorithms for MRI, CT and convolution are generally expressible as left invertible matrices. Also, the framework can be used to improve linear deconvolution and tackle such stubborn linear inverse problems as the Laplace transform.

PACS numbers: 42.30.Wb 87.57.Nk 87.57.Gg

The widely used design framework for image reconstruction algorithms of linear forward problems is dependent on prior information [5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. Prior information is usually considered any information not provided by the original data (Prior information is defined in more detail below). But the choice of which prior information to use can be a difficult task as different choices can result in algorithms which generate quite different images for the same data. The wide variety of reconstruction algorithms of the Laplace transform proposed in the literature provides ample evidence of this situation [1]. The complications caused by requiring prior information are acknowledged in the literature but there is no widely accepted framework for image reconstruction that does not use prior information.

To assist in the design of reconstruction algorithms I propose a framework which does not use prior information. The framework is free of prior information, because, as will be proved, the algorithms produced by the framework are expressible as left invertible matrices [2, 3, 4]. The choice of which particular left invertible matrix to use for the reconstruction will depend on the desired focus and noise of the reconstructed image and the information available in the data via the forward problem.

The required proof will be accomplished by showing that for any reconstruction algorithm expressible as a left invertible matrix, the χ^2 fit of any model in model space to the original data will be identical to the χ^2 fit of the same model to the reconstructed image. This property will be referred to as data conservation. Thus, left invertible matrices can be thought of as focusing the data rather than enhancing or altering it and can be considered digital lenses.

To explain the proposed image reconstruction framework it is useful to consider as an example a familiar image reconstruction problem, MRI. Conceptually, an MRI medical scanner can be thought of as the sole eye witness to a crime. After catching a brief glimpse of the suspect, it must reconstruct the image by examining a book of mug shots (a model space of composed all 2D integrable functions) and picking out all mug shots that looked like the perpetrator (any model which fits the data). In the current generally accepted framework for the design of image reconstruction algorithms, the scanner’s reconstruction algorithm then picks the one mug shot (or at most a few), thought to be the “best” suspect, based on prior information, while discarding all the other pictures that look like the perpetrator. Thus the question commonly heard when designing a new reconstruction algorithm is what prior

information to use. It is an important question as a different choice in prior information can results in a very different reconstructed image from the same data.

The novel framework described herein is based on the concept of reconstructing a single image which is comparable to a composite drawing, similar to those routinely issued by police, of all the mug shots that look like the suspect. I will show no information about the perpetrator is lost in the image reconstruction and equally importantly, no information is added. I go on to so show that the 2D FFT reconstruction algorithm used in all, or virtually all, MRI scanners [6, 7, 16, 17] falls within the proposed framework and does not use prior information. This is in spite of the fact that the 2D FFT reconstruction algorithm is usually presented in the literature as using prior information because prior information is commonly used in its derivation.

For a matrix, $\mathbf{A}$, to be considered left invertible, the only property it must have is that there exists a matrix $\mathbf{A}^{-1}$ that satisfies the equation

$$\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{A} \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{I}$ is the identity matrix (+++ find reference other than internet). Thus for $\mathbf{A}$ to be left invertible it must have the same number or greater number of rows as columns. This is important in image reconstruction because the reconstructed image may have many more points then the data. An example of image reconstruction where there are more values in the image than the original data zero filling in MRI reconstruction.

Left invertible matrices should not be confused with generalized inverses [18]. While the generalized inverses used in reconstruction algorithms are also left invertible matrices, left invertible matrices provide a far larger set of matrices from which to select an matrix with the desired focus and noise characteristics. Generalized inverses will be discussed in more detail below.

To reconstruct the composite image generated by the “sole eye witness” we first need a mathematical expression of the scanner’s measurement properties. An equation of this type is called a forward problem. The general form of the linear forward problem is

$$\mathbf{d} = \int_a^b m^O(y) \mathbf{G}(y) dy + \mathbf{e} \quad (2)$$

where the data vector, $\mathbf{d}$, and the data kernel, $\mathbf{G}(y)$ are assumed known. The scanned object, $m^O(y)$, is represented as a model in the model space and is the model of which we

want to reconstruct an image. The noise, $\mathbf{e}$, is assumed to be additive, stationary and have a mean of zero. The noise statistics are characterized by a covariance matrix, $\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{d}}$. The bounds of integration, a and b , are dependent on the particular forward problem.

The MRI scanner measures (sees) a Fourier transform of the object being scanned (the perpetrator). For the 1D Fourier transform the forward problem has the form

$$d_n = \int_0^1 m^O(f) e^{2\pi i f n/N} df + e_n \quad (3)$$

where the index of the data points, n , has a range of 0 to $N - 1$ where N is the number of data points. Both Eqs. (2) and (3) are given in 1D for simplicity, but they can be easily generalized to the 2D FFT used in MRI reconstruction.

The forward problem in Eq. 2, and in particular, the Fourier transform forward problem in Eq. 3 are ill posed problems. This is because the finite number of data points and the noise in the data both allow many different models in model space to fit the data reasonably well [20]. It is the ill posed nature of forward problem which presented such a challenge to image reconstruction for many decades.

The currently used, prior information framework for image reconstruction needs some measure of how well a model in model space fits the data so that, conceptually at least, a subspace of models that fit the data can be constructed. In our analogy, after the MRI scanner has made its measurements, it can be thought of as viewing all mug shots in the book (all 2D functions) and choosing all the ones that look like the perpetrator. The most commonly used measures of whether a particular model in model space fits the data are the χ^2 measure and the least squares measure [11, 12, 14]. The least squares measure is equal to the χ^2 measure if the noise covariance matrix is set equal to the identity matrix. Therefore, only the χ^2 measure will be considered for the rest of this letter. The χ^2 measure is calculated by

$$\chi^2 = (\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{d}^m)^T \mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{d}-1} (\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{d}^m) \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{d}^m$ is the data predicted by each model in model space and is calculated by

$$\mathbf{d}^m = \int_a^b m(y) \mathbf{G}(y) dy. \quad (5)$$

In the proposed framework the reconstruction algorithm is assumed to be expressible as a matrix multiplication. Thus, the form of the image reconstruction algorithm is

$$\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{d} \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{A}$ is the image reconstruction matrix and $\mathbf{h}$ is the reconstructed image. For calculation purposes, the image is assumed discretized into M points where the discretization is sufficiently finely discretized to approximate a continuous function. The the reconstruction matrix, A , has M rows and N columns. It follows that the covariance of the noise in the image, $\mathbf{C}^h$, is calculated by

$$\mathbf{C}^h = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{C}^d \mathbf{A}^T. \quad (7)$$

Also, the image kernel (resolution kernel), $\mathbf{R}(y)$, is calculated by

$$\mathbf{R}(y) = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{G}(y). \quad (8)$$

In the prior information framework of linear inverse theory, the reconstructed image is thought of as the best image (model) that fits the data where what is best is decided with the aid of prior information, information in addition to the data. The proposed framework breaks with this practice by considering the reconstructed image to be a reformulated forward problem. Further, I will conjecture that it is the current practice of radiologists when interpret MRI images, they are interpreting as forward problems rather than models.

Examination of Eq. (2) shows that a forward problem is composed of three parts: data, data noise statistics and a data kernel. Examination of Eqs. (6), (7) and (8) shows that the image also has these three components. Thus an image reconstructed by an algorithm representable as a matrix multiplication also has the mathematical form of a forward problem. In addition, the original and reformulated image forward problems are defined on the same model space.

As mentioned above, when $\mathbf{A}$ is left invertible, a property that the original and image forward problems share is that any model in model space will have the identical χ^2 measure for the original and image forward problem. This property of data conservation means that the original and image forward problems will have exactly the same information about the scanned object. Data conservation is one of the two key properties of the proposed framework. The second is data focusing and will be considered below.

The concept of data conservation and prior information are closely linked. If the original data and the reconstructed image have exactly the same information about the scanned object then no additional information could have been added or lost during the image reconstruction. Thus, either prior information was not used in the reconstruction, or if it was, it had no impact on the reconstruction. If prior information did have an impact on the

reconstruction then data conservation would be violated. Thus, prior information can be defined as the absence of data conservation.

The proof of data conservation is as follows: The χ^2 measure for the image forward problem is

$$\chi^2 = (\mathbf{h} - \mathbf{h}^m)^T \mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{h}^{-1}} (\mathbf{h} - \mathbf{h}^m) \quad (9)$$

where $\mathbf{h}^m$ is calculated by substituting Eq. (5) into Eq. (6). If data conservation holds when $\mathbf{A}$ is left invertible then Eq. (9) will equal to Eq. (4). Eq. (9) simplifies to (4) when Eqs. (6), (7) and

$$\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{h}^{-1}} = \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{d}^{-1}} \mathbf{A}^{-1}. \quad (10)$$

are substituted into (9). Eq. (10) is used to calculate $\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{d}^{-1}}$ from $\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{h}^{-1}}$ and follows from Rao [21]. Thus, the χ^2 measure of fit for any model in model space will be identical for the original data and image forward problems if the reconstruction algorithm is representable as a left invertible matrix. Therefore, data conservation holds if the reconstruction matrix is left invertible.

In addition to data conservation, the proposed framework uses the familiar concept of focused data. The parallels between focusing using a matrix and focusing with a glass lens have been understood for many years [22]. Focused data is used in Wiener deconvolution [5], the 2D FFT and filtered back project. The left invertible matrices used in these algorithms generates data functions in the image kernel that are much more similar to Dirac delta function than in the original data kernel, thus focusing the data (Eq. 8). However, while choosing a matrix $\mathbf{A}$ which improves the focus of the image kernel, the corresponding increase in noise of the image must not be allowed to get too large (Eq. 7). This choice of focus and trade off between focus and noise is an inherent part of the design in any linear reconstruction algorithm. It is part of the reason why a window is routinely used in MRI reconstruction and a filter used in filtered back projection. It is also explicitly dealt with in Wiener deconvolution. Backus and Gilbert [23] also use the concept of focus data and the tradeoff between resolution and noise but do not use the concept of data conservation.

The prior information framework for the design of image reconstruction algorithms is based on the requirement of fitting the data. This requirement demands that any reconstruction algorithm produced by the framework must generate an image that, when inserted back into the forward problem (Eq. 2), reproduces the data exactly or at least to within

the noise. If the reconstruction algorithm is linear (Eq. 6) the exact fitting constraint of the prior information framework leads to the requirement on the reconstruction matrix, $\mathbf{A}$, that

$$\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} \quad (11)$$

where $\mathbf{I}$ is the identity matrix with dimensions $N \times N$ and G is the discretized form of the forward problem (Eq. 2) and has M rows and N columns.

It is illuminating to compare Eq. 11 with Eq. 1 as they provide the primary restrictions on the reconstruction matrices in each of their respective frameworks. The restriction of left invertibility, which results in data conservation, is much less restrictive than that of generalized invertibility. This is the case because in Eq. 1 the matrix $\mathbf{A}^{-1}$ can be any matrix while in Eq. 11 it must be G . Experience has shown, the much wider choice in reconstruction matrix provided by data conservation in many cases permits the choice of a reconstruction matrix with far superior focus and noise characteristics. Examples of reconstruction algorithms which fit into this framework are the standard MRI and CT reconstruction algorithms.

Comparison of equations Eq. 11 with Eq. 1 also shows that generalized inverses are left invertible and are thus data conserving. But Eq. 11 applies only to reconstruction algorithms which produce exact fits to the data. But not all reconstruction algorithms produce exact fits. Some forms of regularization used in the prior information framework relax the fitting constraint slightly by introducing a misfit parameter, such as χ^2 . In this case Eq. 11 is only satisfied approximately and, as a consequence, data conservation only applied approximately.

Frequently, in the prior information framework, nonlinear reconstruction algorithms are used. The left invertible matrix is a linear reconstruction algorithm thus data conservation will need to be proved for nonlinear reconstruction algorithms case by case.

It is useful to consider three highly popular reconstruction algorithms in terms of the data conservation and prior information frameworks: 1) the windowed 2D FFT used in MRI reconstruction, 2) the filtered back projection used in CT reconstruction and 3) Wiener deconvolution for linear deconvolution. The 2D FFT without the window, back projection without the filter and Wiener deconvolution all fit into the prior information framework as reconstructed image fits the original data. As is well known, all three algorithms can be derived using the least squares fit to the data. They also fit into the data conservation framework as they are left invertible algorithms. In all three cases the image kernel is much

better focused than the data kernel.

In routine use the 2D FFT and back projection are modified by a window and filter respectively [8, 9] to tailor the focus and noise performance of the reconstruction algorithms to the needs of their daily applications. When the window or filter is introduced Eq. 11 is no longer satisfied. For example, in the case of the windowed 2D FFT the left hand side will equal the coefficients of the window, which is very different from the identity matrix. Thus the reconstruction algorithms currently used do not fit into the prior information framework. But, as long as all coefficients of the windows and filters are nonzero, the algorithms are left invertible, and thus still data conserving.

It is conjectured above radiologist routinely interpret MRI images as forward problems. To do so they would need to consider, not only the data in the image, but image noise and image kernel functions. When radiologists look at an MRI image they take note of the noise and resolution of the image when making their interpretations. For most clinical MRI images the signal to noise is reasonably good and the resolution has a width below 1mm due to the image kernel functions being similar to Dirac delta functions. Most models which fit poorly to the image are quickly and easily ruled out because of the nature of the χ^2 fit. If a model is a bad fit to one part of an image it must also be a bad fit to the image as a whole because the value of the χ^2 cannot be made smaller by the rest of the image. Thus radiologists are taking advantage of data focusing and data conservation to effectively rule in and out models in their head treating the image as a forward problem. Thus they are treating the reconstructed image a composite of possible brains than as one particular brain.

There are many ways to generate a left invertible matrix with a good focus. For the inverse Fourier transform, linear convolution and the back projection problem, the least squares fit to the data usually results in a left invertible matrix with reasonable good focus. I conjecture the least squares fit works so well on these three problems because the least squares fits produces the same image as Backus and Gilbert's Dirichlet focusing criterion [23]. The Dirichlet criterion appears to produce good focus for images that have spatial invariant image kernels. This is true for the Fourier transform, Wiener deconvolution and approximately true near the center of image in filtered back projection.

But the least squares fit does not always generate a left invertible matrix with a good focus. Applying the least square fit to the Laplace transform yields a reconstruction matrix which is left invertible, provided enough rows are used, but with a terrible focus. The

proposed framework has been applied to the Laplace transform to generate a left invertible matrix with a good focus and reasonable noise characteristic [3]. One guideline which is useful in the design of a left invertible matrix is that each point in the image has the same standard deviation for the noise. As each point in the image corresponds to a row in the reconstruction matrix, each row can be tailored individually to get the best combined of resolution and noise. For particular problems, such as the inverse Laplace transform, it maybe be necessary to design several reconstruction matrices each which produces a different noise in the image. The various reconstruction algorithms can then be applied a few typical data sets to determined the desired tradeoff between focus and noise.

The proposed framework could easily be applied to linear deconvolution by designing a linear deconvolution operator which is left invertible and which has different focusing properties than Wiener deconvolution, for example with less side lobes.

Many researchers believe that solving any linear inverse problem, including image reconstruction, requires information in addition to that available in the data. However, the proposed framework shows there exist image reconstruction algorithms that neither add nor take away information to the data. Instead, they only focus the data making it easier to interpret and manage. After data conserving reconstruction, the focused data can be used for interpretation, model fitting and most other processes intended for the original data. It was shown the standard reconstruction algorithms for MRI, CT and linear deconvolution are already data conserving. Thus, image reconstruction algorithms which are both data conserving and data focusing already play a large role in modern data analysis and may have an even larger one in the future.

Research was supported by D. W. Paty, D. K. B. Li and the MS/MRI Research Group of the University of British Columbia. I thank A. L. MacKay, B.W. van Dijk, J.J.M. Zwambag, J.P.A. Kuijer and H. Vrenken for comments.

-
- [1] A. A. Istratov, and O. F. Vyvenko Rev. Sci. Instr. **70**, 1233 (1999).
 - [2] K. S. Cover, Optimal Linear resolution and conservation of information. PIMS-MITACS Workshop on Inverse Problems and Imaging, Vancouver, Canada, June 2001.
 - [3] K. S. Cover, Ph.D. Thesis University of British Columbia, 2001.

- [4] K. S. Cover, Image reconstruction without prior information. Poster presented the Human Brain Mapping Conference, New York City, June 18-22, 2003.
- [5] N. Wiener, *Extrapolation, Interpolation and Smoothing of Stationary Times Series*. (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1949).
- [6] J. A. Parker, *Image reconstruction in radiology* (CRC Press, Boston, 1990).
- [7] M. Bertero. and P. Boccacci, *Introduction to inverse problems in imaging* (IOP Publishing, London, 1998).
- [8] F. J. Harris, Proc. IEEE **66**, 51 (1978).
- [9] T. H. Farquhar, A. Chatziioannou, G. Chinn, M. Dahlbom, & E. J. Hoffman EEE Trans. Nucl. Sci. **45**, 1133 (1998).
- [10] P. C. Sabatier, J. Math. Phys. **41**, 4082 (2000).
- [11] S. Twomey, *Introduction to the Mathematics of Inversion of Remote Sensing and Indirect Data*. (Amsterdam, Elsevier, 1977)
- [12] W. Menke, *Geophysical Data Analysis: Discrete Inverse Theory*. (Academic Press, New York, 1984).
- [13] R. L. Parker, *Geophysical inverse theory* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1994).
- [14] A. Tarantola, *Inverse Problem Theory* (New York, Elsevier, 1987).
- [15] Z. P. Liang, F. E. Boada, R. T. Constable, E. M. Haacke, P. C. Lauterburand, M. R. Smith, Rev. Magn. Reson. Med. **4**, 67 (1992).
- [16] W. A. Edelstein, J. M. S. Hutchison, G. Johnson and T. Redpath Phys. Med. Biol. **25**, 751 (1980).
- [17] C. N. Chen and D. I. Hoult, *Biomedical Magnetic Resonance Technology*. (Adam Hilger, New York, 1989).
- [18] A. Ben-Israel, T. N. E. Greville, *Generalized inverses theory and applications* (New York, Wiley, 1974)
- [19] W. H. Press, S. A. Teukolsky, W. T. Vetterling, B. P. Flannery, *Numerical recipes in C 2nd Ed.* (Cambridge, Cambrigde University Press, 1992)
- [20] D. W. Oldenburg, Geophys. J. R. astr. Soc. **44**, 413 (1975).
- [21] C. R. Rao, *Linear statistical inference and its applications 2d ed.* (Wiley, New York, 1973).
- [22] P. B. Fellgett and F. B. Schmeidler, Roy. Ast. Soc. Notices **112**, 445 (1952).
- [23] G. Backus and F. Gilbert, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A. **266**, 123 (1970).